State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources-WT/3 101 S. Webster St. Madison, WI 53707

dnr.wi.gov

Final Report

Targeted Runoff Management Grant Program and Urban Nonpoint Source and Storm Water Management Grant Program

Form 3400-189 (R 6/08)

Page 1

Notice: This final report is authorized by ss. 281.65 and 281.66, Wis. Stats., and chs. NR 153 and NR 155, Wis. Adm. Code. Personally identifiable information collected will be used for program administration and may be made available to requesters as required under Wisconsin's Open Records Law [ss. 19.31-19.39, Wis. Stats.].

Instructions: Your grant agreement requires you to submit a Final Report 60 days after the end date listed in the grant agreement. This Final Report form must be used in conjunction with the "FINAL REPORT INSTRUCTIONS." The instructions detail how to complete and submit the report to DNR. The DNR prefers that Final Reports be submitted in electronic format. If, however, printed copies of Final Reports are submitted, please submit three (3) complete originals to your regional Nonpoint Coordinator.

| 1. Grant Ty | pe – Please check on | e. | | | | Ally Many | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| Targeted Runoff Management Grant – Agricultural | | | | Targeted Runoff Management Grant – Urban | | | |
| Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management Grant – Construction | | | | ☐ Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management Grant Planning | | | |
| 2. Grantee | & Project Information | | | | | | |
| Project Nar | ne | | | Grant Number | | | |
| Stormwate | r Management Plan | and Utility | | USP - UR02-28246-06 | | | |
| Governmer | ntal Unit Name | | | Primary Watershed Nam | ne and Watershed Code | | |
| City of Lak | ce Mills | | | Lower Crawfish River | | | |
| Nearest Wa | ater Body Name | | | Nearest Water Body Ide | ntification Code (WBIC) | (if applicable) | |
| DNR Water | r Management Unit (R | iver System) Name | | s. 303 (d) Listed Waterb | ody? ☐ Yes ☒ No. | | |
| Upper Roc | k River | | | | | | |
| What pollut | tant(s) were addresse | d by the project (e.g., nit | trogen, phosphorus, se | diment, thermal control, e | etc.)? | | |
| The projec | t developed a comp | rehensive plan and de | dicated funding sour | ce to address sediment | and other nonpoint so | ource pollutants | |
| For <u>each</u> p | roject site location pro | vide the following: (attac | ch additional sheets if r | necessary) | | | |
| | Location: | Α | В | С | D | E | |
| Minor Civil Division Name (City, Township, Village, etc.) | | City of Lake Mills | (continued) | (continued) | (continued) | | |
| PLSS | Town | T7N | T7N | T8N | T8N | | |
| | Range | R13E | R14E | R13E | R14E | | |
| | Section | 1,2,11,12,13,14,23, 24,25 | 6,7,8,17,18,19,20,30 | 36 | 31 | | |
| | Quarter | ALL, except for north half of 25 | ALL, except W half of 8, 17 & 20 | South half of 36 | South half of 31 | | |
| | Quarter-Quarter | | | | aq as | | |
| Latitude (degrees, minutes, seconds North of Equator; use the DNR's Surface Water Data Viewer, SWDV) | | 43 deg. 4' 44'' | | | | | |
| Longitude (degrees, minutes, seconds W of Prime Meridian, use the SWDV) | | 88 deg. 54' 49'' | | | | | |
| Property Owner(s) | Name | N/A | | | | | |
| Mailing address | | N/A | | | | | |

| ı | D. | 2 | 4 | _ | 2 |
|---|----|----|----|---|---|
| | г. | a١ | J٤ | 3 | _ |

| | | *************************************** | | |
|---------------------------|-----|---|------|--|
| Site address (Not mailing | N/A | | | |
| address) | | | | |
| | | | | |

3. Summary of Results

A. Performance Standards and Prohibitions and Other Water Resources Management Priorities

For grants issued in calendar year 2006 or later, complete Tables A and B (following) consistent with the entries on your grant application.

TABLE A. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND PROHIBITIONS (per ch. NR 151, Wis. Adm. Code, effective October 1, 2002)

| Performance Standard or Prohibition | Units of Measure | Quantity | Measurement Method Used |
|---|---------------------------------|----------|-------------------------|
| Sheet, rill and wind erosion | Acres meeting T | | |
| Manure Storage Facilities: New Construction/Alterations | Number of facilities | | |
| | Number of animal units | | |
| Manure Storage Facilities: Closure | Number of facilities | | |
| Manure Storage Facilities: Failing/Leaking Facilities | Number of facilities | | |
| | Number of animal units | | |
| Clean Water Diversions in WQMA | Pollutant load reduction | | |
| | Number of farms with diversions | | |
| | Number animal units | | |
| Nutrient Management on Agricultural Land | Acres planned | | |
| Prohibition: Manure Storage Overflow | Number of facilities | | |
| | Number of animal units | | |
| Prohibition: Unconfined Manure Pile in WQMA | Number of farms | | |
| Prohibition: Direct Runoff From Feedlot/Stored Manure | Pollutant load reduction | | |
| | Number of facilities | | |
| | Number of animal units | | |
| Prohibition: Unlimited Livestock Access | Feet of bank protected | | |
| | Number of farms | | |
| Urban: 20-40% Reduction in Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | Pounds TSS reduced | | |
| | % TSS reduction | | |

TABLE B. OTHER WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PRIORITIES

| I. Agricultural Areas | Units of Measure | Quantity | Measurement Method Used |
|--|----------------------------------|----------|-------------------------|
| Buffers | Feet of bank protected | 710-31 | |
| | Number of farms | | |
| Streambank | Tons of bank erosion reduced | | |
| | Feet of bank protected | | |
| Other (specify) | | | |
| II. Developed Urban Areas | Units of Measure | Quantity | Measurement Method Used |
| Urban: 20-40% Reduction in TSS | Pounds TSS reduced | | |
| | % TSS reduction | | |
| Infiltration | % Pre-development stay-on volume | | |
| | Cubic feet stay-on volume | | |
| Peak flow discharge | Change in cubic feet per second | | |
| Protective areas | Feet of bank protected | | |
| Fueling & maintenance areas | Oily sheen presence | | |
| Streambank | Tons of bank erosion reduced | | |
| | Feet of bank protected | | |
| Other (specify) | | | |
| III. Planning | Units of Measure | Quantity | Measurement Method Used |
| Quantify how implementation of the planning project | Municipalities planned for | 1 | Count |
| decreased storm water impacts on state waters (i.e., storm water plan, I & E plan, etc.) | Acres planned for | 2287 | Measured |
| Document/track progress made in implementing the | Municipalities planned for | 1 | Count |
| planning product (i.e., ordinance, utility district evaluation/formation, storm water management plan information & education, etc.) | Acres planned for | 2287 | Measured |

| Final Report Targeted Form 3400-189 (R 6/08) | unoff Managen | nent and Urban Nonpoint Sourc | e & Storm Water Management Gra | ant Programs | *************************************** | Page 3 |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Other (specify) | | | | | | |
| Mills and Strand Associate Lake Mills. Supporting da measurement of all nonrest Equivalent Runoff Units at guidance from a Stormwar Task Force held six meetin consensus of the task force reasons included the curriforce additional spending, meeting. However, the frat Ordinance, Credit Policy, Should the City choose to Stormwater Plan - The proof Lake Mills and Strand A Council on April 7, 2009. That will increase the City- | es. This project ta included a fisidential impend probable rater Utility Taskings at the endie included recent economic. The City Countework of the mpervious Arradopt the Stoject has been associates. A fishe report included TSS redution of two wetside two wetsides and included the second to the second to the report included TSS redution of two wetsides and included the second to the second t | the tresulted in creation of supporteasibility Study, including an avious areas and typical residences per ERU's. The Feasibility Force, a draft stormwater util of 2008 and developed a documendations to the City Commendations to the City Commendations to the City Commendations to the City Commendations to the City Commendation of a Bill rmwater Utility has been can always and the future, the completed in conformance with the complete commendations regard the complete complete commendations regard the commendations regard the complete commendations regard the complete commendations regard the commendatio | NR-approved Professional Server orting data for creation of a Stormalysis of stormwater costs and sential impervious areas. Based Study was approved by the Citylity ordinance and credit policy furnent titled "Stormwater Utility buncil not to proceed with adopt pacts to area businesses, and lated adoption of the Stormwater Utilicompleted, including the following information can be used. The DNR-approved Profession anagement Plan was drafted in light in the Complete of the Co | mwater Utilit funding alter on this data, / Council in a were develop Task Force F ion of the Sto ck of a stor ity at the Ma ng elements: t of a Stormw mal Services March 2009 a structural and 81 pounds) t | y Distrinatives estima June 20 led. The Findings or mwater by 5, 200 Storm vater Ut Contract and pred non-sto 30.1% | ict in the City of a second with a second with a second with a stormwater Utility second with a seco |
| | t was offered u | | compliance with performance stan | dards or proh | ibitions, | provide information |
| for each notice in the table b | elow. | Notice Information | | Notic | e Satis | faction Information |
| | | | | Satis | n de la companya de l | |
| Notice Type | Issue Date | From (Name) | To (Name) | Yes | No | Date Letter Sent |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | П | |
| | | - And t | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 5. Summary of Project Chal | enges | | | | <u> U</u> | |
| educating the public and | elected official ly a shift in the | s of the need for a stormwater method of funding stormwat | ical of stormwater utility format r utility. Also, providing the pub er management improvements a | lic with an u | ndersta | inding that the |
| 7. Final Product(s) All Pro | | | | | | |
| A. Construction Pr | • | printed copy of project along | d appoifications was southern | NID Deeler | | int Course |
| A.1. Checking here Coordinator. | indicates that a | printed copy of project plans an | d specifications was sent to your [| JNR Regional | Nonpo | Int Source |
| | indicates that p | hoto-documentation of the proje | ct's construction is attached. | | | |
| B. Planning Projects | | | | | | |
| B.1. Checking here i Nonpoint Source Coo | | printed copy of the planning pro | duct (e.g., plans, ordinances, anal | yses) was ser | | |
| B.2. Checking here i | ndicates that th | e Regional Nonpoint Source Co | ordinator has approved the final P | lanning Produ | ict(s). 💈 | SW UTILITY FERE. STUD |
| B.3. Checking here i | ndicates that yo | our governmental unit has adopt | ed the final Planning Product(s). | W FEASIE | ury | study only) |
| Name of Planning Documer | t(s) | | Date(s) effective | Date Submitte | d to NP | S Coordinator |